

**REMARKS**

In an Official Action dated April 5, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 and 7-12 as being anticipated by Wozencroft 5,573,513. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection in light of the amendments to the claims. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner favorably consider newly added claims 20-32.

In the Official Action, the Examiner withdrew claims 4, 5 and 17 as being directed to a non-elected species. However, the features in these claims are present in the elected species. For instance, claim 4 recites that the first lock comprises a latch and a first opening on the inner housing and the second lock comprises the latch and a second opening in the inner housing. Referring to Figs. 10 and 11, the elected embodiment includes an inner housing having a pair of openings 141, 142 that cooperate with the locking tab 154 on the end of cantilever beam 153 (see Fig. 7) of the clip 150. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the withdrawal of the claims.

In the Official Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 2 was allowable over the prior art of record. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the device comprises a connector for connecting the plunger to the inner housing. Since the prior art does not teach or suggest the combination of features in claims 1, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claim 1, along with dependent claims 3-7. Similarly, claim 8 recites the step of attaching a plunger to an inner housing, which is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claim 8, along with dependent claims 9 and 11.

In the Official Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 13 was allowable over the prior art of record. Claim 12 has been amended to recite that the device comprises a plunger adapted to expel medicinal fluid from the cartridge during use, wherein the plunger comprises a gripping surface adapted to be grasped in combination with the



Patent Application No. 10/098,729

finger change to drive the plunger forwardly. Since the prior art does not teach or suggest the combination of features in claim 12, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claim 12, along with dependent claims 14-16 and 18-19.

**RECEIVED**  
AUG 11 2004  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Finally, Applicants request that the Examiner favorably consider newly added claims 20-32.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that this application is in form for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes that issues remain regarding the allowability of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN  
A Professional Corporation  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By


  
Stephen H. Eland  
PTO Registration No. 41,010

Telephone: (215) 563-4100  
Facsimile: (215) 563-4044

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this Response and accompanying papers are being deposited on **August 5, 2004** with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope properly addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

August 5, 2004  
Date of Certificate

  
Stephen Eland